

Remarks

As stated above, Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough examination of the subject application and request reexamination and reconsideration of the subject application in view of the following remarks.

As of the subject action, claims 1-18 are pending, of which claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 12, 14, and 17 are independent claims, and claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 9-11, 13, 15, 16, and 18 are dependent. With this response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 12, 16, and 18. Applicants have cancelled claims 2-6, 9, 11, 13-15, and 17. Also, Applicants have added new claims 19-31. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is believed to have been added.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-7 and 14-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0018510 (hereinafter "Sanches".) Applicants have cancelled claims 2-6, 14, 15, and 17. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that Sanches does not appear to disclose each and every limitation of Applicants' newly amended independent claim 1 because Sanches does not appear to disclose the limitations of: (i) "conducting a synergy via a graphical user interface[,]'" (ii) "creating at least one comparison of the synergy against a synergy target for the synergy by measuring the synergy against the synergy target[,'" (iii) "capturing a history of the enterprise change[,'" and (iv) "applying the history to at least one subsequent enterprise change to achieve a subsequent synergy in the at least one subsequent enterprise change." Amended independent claim 1 is provided below for the Examiner's convenience:

1. (Currently Amended) A method of facilitating enterprise change comprising:

treating two or more information systems as a single logical information system to execute pre-change due diligence and post-change integration of the enterprise change, wherein the enterprise change is at least one of a merger and acquisition;

identifying a synergy;

conducting a synergy via a graphical user interface;

creating at least one comparison of the synergy against a synergy target for the synergy by measuring the synergy against the synergy target;

capturing a history of the enterprise change; and

applying the history to at least one subsequent enterprise change to achieve a subsequent synergy in the at least one subsequent enterprise change. (See Applicant's amended claim 1; emphasis added.)

As indicated, Applicants' newly amended claim 1 is generally directed towards synergy in enterprise change. Support for Applicants' amendment to claim 1 may be found throughout the specification, such as, for example, at paragraphs [0030] and [0034] of the subject application, as published. Paragraphs [0030] and [0034] of the subject application are provided below for the Examiner's convenience:

[0030] As shown in FIG. 2, the restructuring integration process 100 includes a deal selection process 102. The deal selection process 102 defines acquisition objectives and strategies. The deal selection process 102 searches for the best fit target company to meet a set of objectives and manages detailed due diligence on the target company. The deal selection process 102 also identifies synergies, risks and a realization plan for acquiring the target company. (See the subject application, as published, paragraph [0030]; emphasis added.)

[0034] The restructuring integration process 100 includes a post-integration assessment process 110. The post-integration assessment process 110 measures achieved synergies against targets, accesses where improvements can be made in synergy estimation and/or in integration execution, and applies history to a next transaction. (See the subject application, as published, paragraph [0034]; emphasis added.)

It is Applicants' understanding that Sanches does not disclose subject matter regarding Applicants' amendments to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Sanches does

not disclose each and every limitation of Applicants' claim 1. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that newly amended independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Since claims 7, 16, and 18, as well as new claims 19-27, depend, either directly or indirectly, from Applicants' newly amended independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that those claims are in condition for allowance as well. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 7, 16, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 8-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanches in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0225652 (hereinafter "Minow".) Also, claims 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minow in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0158479 (hereinafter "Adhikari".) Applicants have cancelled claims 9, 11, 13. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that Sanches, Minow, and Adhikari do not appear to disclose each and every limitation of Applicants' newly amended claims 8, 10, and 12, whether viewed singly or in combination. Claims 8, 10, and 12 have been amended to depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that Sanches does not appear to disclose each and every limitation of Applicants' independent claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Minow nor Adhikari appear to disclose the limitations of: (i) "conducting a synergy via a graphical user interface[,]" (ii) "creating at least one comparison of the synergy against a synergy target for the synergy by measuring the synergy against the synergy target[,]" (iii) "capturing a history of the enterprise change[,]" and (iv) "applying the history to at least one subsequent enterprise change to achieve a subsequent

synergy in the at least one subsequent enterprise change." Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Sanches, Minow, and Adhikari do not appear to disclose each and every limitation of Applicants' independent claim 1, whether viewed singly, or in combination. Since claims 8, 10, and 12 depend from claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Sanches, Minow, and Adhikari do not appear to disclose each and every limitation of those claims either. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that newly amended claims 8, 10, and 12 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8, 10, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Applicants have added new claims 19-31. New claims 20-22 include subject matter which may be found throughout the specification, such as, for example, in paragraphs [0066] and [0099] of the subject application, as published. New claims 23 and 31 include subject matter which may be found throughout the specification, such as, for example, in paragraph [0101]. New claim 27 includes subject matter which may be found throughout the specification, such as, for example, in paragraph [0117]. Finally, new claim 28 is a *Beauregard* claim which includes subject matter from claim 1. Support for the *Beauregard* language in new claim 28 may be found throughout the specification, such as, for example, in Fig. 1.

Having overcome all of the outstanding rejections, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject application is now in condition for allowance. Applicants believe that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally,

nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper.

In light of the above-described remarks, Applicants respectfully assert that the subject application is in condition for allowance. While Applicants respectfully assert that the subject application is now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney (617-305-2143) to facilitate prosecution of this application. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 50-2324.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 19 December 2008

/Brian J. Colandreo/
Brian J. Colandreo
Reg. No. 42,427

Holland & Knight LLP
10 St. James Avenue
Boston, MA 02116-3889
Telephone: 617-305-2143
Facsimile: 617-523-6850

5908827_v1